

GRADUATE ASSEMBLY MEETING

October 7, 2004

SUMMARY OF THE MEETING

-
- [Heard announcements.](#)
- [Heard reports from the GA Manager and the Funding Advisor.](#)
- [Heard a report from External Affairs on Propositions on the November ballot.](#)
- [Approved by voice-vote a motion to allow the External Affairs Committee, in preparing its voters guide, to make recommendations as a Committee, rather than having all stands endorsed by the GA. With no objection, removed Prop. 62 from the list of Propositions to be considered.](#)
- [Approved the reports from the External Affairs Committee, the President, the External Affairs Vice President, and the Academic Affairs Vice President, the Executive Board, the Academic Affairs Committee, and the Finance Committee.](#)
- [Approved the report from the Funding Committee, approving Round 2 of Grad Events funding and Round 1 of Grants categories, and Round 1 of Projects and Services grants.](#)
- [Heard a report from the GA's Graduate Council representatives.](#)
- [Heard a report from the ASUC's representative to the GA and discussed autonomy.](#)
- [Heard a report on the Store Operations Board.](#)
- [Elected Josh Daniels \(Law\) as Chair of the Organization and Rules Committee.](#)
- [Approved Resolution In Support of Prop. 63; Resolution In Support of Prop. 66; Resolution In Support of Prop. 72, as amended; and Resolution In Support of Prop. 64, as amended.](#)

This regular meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order by Rishi Sharma at 5:35 p.m. in the ASUC Senate Chamber. Mr. Sharma said he would like to welcome them to the second GA meeting of the academic year.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Mr. Sharma said that if they didn't receive one, agenda packets, with all the reports and Resolutions, were available. If there were no changes to the agenda, he would entertain a motion to approve. It was so moved and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AGENDA FOR THE MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Approval of the Minutes

- 2 -

Mr. Sharma said the minutes to the September meeting were available on the Web site. A motion to approve was made and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 9, 2004 MEETING PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Sharma called for any announcements related to the GA, and said he had one. The GA By-laws set up an Affirmative Action Committee that hasn't been convened yet. It was their hope that the Committee would focus on issues of faculty diversity, as that has been a main focus of the Academic Senate recently. If people were interested in serving on this Committee, they could make a note on the sign-up sheet or send him an e-mail. They would like to get this Committee convened before the November meeting. The agenda was not limited to faculty diversity, but general affirmative action, diversity, and access issues.

Misha Leybovich introduced himself and said that if people were free on Friday at noon, the ASUC was having its culmination of the 40th anniversary of the Free Speech Movement celebration on Sproul. It will be great. He actually learned the other day that the GA was born out of the FSM, so he'd give a little shout out to his favorite graduate government on campus. There will be a bunch of cool speakers, including Julia Vinograd, a poet, Sen. Jackie Goldberg, and former Vermont Governor Howard Dean. Speakers will talk on top of a police car, like what happened in the '60s. It should be really wonderful. He would ask them to please come out, from 12:00 to 1:30, after which they'll have teach-ins on a bunch of different issues, such as racial inequality, police brutality, civil liberties, and cyber liberties. The teach-ins will be in and around Sproul Hall. If Delegates happen to be a GSI, he would ask them to please give their students credit for attending. He wanted to thank them for supporting them in this effort. (Applause).

Mr. Sharma said that as for AGSE, he believed a membership meeting was coming up, and people should get an e-mail about that. AGSE is the Association of Grad Student Employees, the Union of grad student instructors, tutors, and readers on the Berkeley campus.

Mr. Cruz introduced himself and said he was from the School of Education. There will be a great debate on campus on affirmative action, co-sponsored BAMN and the Federalist Society of the Boalt Law School, a libertarian group, as well as the Law School. It will feature the Dean of the Law School, Christopher Edley, as a moderator, in a debate between the National Director of the UEAA, United for Equality and Affirmative Action, which presented the students' pro-affirmative action case in the Michigan Law School trial last year

before the Supreme Court, and someone from the Center for Equal Opportunity, which is Linda Chavez' group, which sued the University of Michigan. The debate will be October 27 at 6 p.m. at the Law School. Mr. Cruz said he would pass around information. Also, there will be a very important Statewide march for civil rights, for immigrants' rights, and against the detention of several thousand people in June, with 470 people deported by the Border Patrol, and even surrounded a high school at one point. And everybody who was targeted was of Mexican descent. The march is to declare that they're all Californians. There will be transportation going down to Los Angeles. Even if people weren't sure they could make it, they should write their name on the interest list.

Announcements (cont'd)

- 3 -

Mr. Schechtman introduced himself and said he was from the German Department and was the GA Academic Affairs VP. The Mental Health Task Force, which was started last year under the GA, was now forming as a self-standing student group. If people were interested in this, they could go to Office of Student Life's Web site and get more information. Also, one of its members asked him to let the GA know that on Sunday morning, from 9:00 to 1:00, in Golden Gate Park, there will be a "walk out of the darkness," to raise awareness of, and raise funds for, fighting depression. They are looking for people not only to walk, but if they have a couple of hours, to volunteer with registration and handing out water. They'd get a T-shirt for free. It's great cause. There will be a couple of thousand people there. He'd pass around some fliers, and Delegates could take one if they're interested, or just put one up on a bulletin board, if they access to one. The event was on Sunday.

REPORTS

Report from the GA Manager/Advisor

Ms. Dugas said she'll have a big budget report in November, is the first-quarter report. They'll try to get it out so people have time to ask any questions. Also, the GA is hiring for new positions, and they have a lot of applications. She agreed to keep the application deadline open one more day because some people wanted to apply. People could look at her report to see about any open positions they might be interested in. People could pick up an application online or at the GA.

Report from the Funding Advisor

Ms. Moore said her report was in the packet, and included funding allocations and things connected to that. The deadline for the next funding round is October 22, and information was included in the report. Dates for funding workshops in October were in the report. For the funding allocations for that evening, she believed Mr. Lanting, Chair of the Funding Committee, will not be there that evening. If people have questions about

the funding allocations, they could send him an e-mail. She wasn't present at the entire Funding Committee meeting and wasn't sure she could answer every question. Her e-mail was in the report and she could forward any questions to Mr. Lanting.

Mr. Sharma said he believed that some Project Coordinators also included written reports in the agenda packet. Mr. Turner, the GMSP Coordinator, had a report included in the back.

Reporting as the Departmental Liaison, Mr. Cantor said he had written report in the agenda packet. He realized a lot of Delegates were new, since he creates the sponsorship and makes their name tags. If they find themselves asking why they were there, in terms of what they're doing at the GA, they're all Delegates to an organization. Some of them may know, and some may not know, their roles and know how to work in those roles. Some of them may have volunteered, and some may have been pressured in their department to attend. If people have questions of that nature, or want to do something with the GA, they

Report from the Funding Advisor (cont'd)

- 4 -

should talk to him and he'd try to direct them to the person who could help them. Or, he could plug them into a committee where they could do whatever it is that they want with the GA. Mr. Cantor said they should use him as that kind of resource.

For other, small things, when they come to GA meetings, Mr. Cantor said he would ask them to please make sure they get their name tags from the gray box and sign in. The cups can be recycled, so if they could do that, it would make him happy.

Officer Reports

A motion was made and seconded to go to the report from the External Affairs Vice President, and passed with no objection.

Ms. Sharma said the External Affairs Committee has recommendations listed for the various propositions on the California State ballot. If there were questions about any of them, they could try to answer them.

Mr. Sharma said the written report by the External Affairs Committee is on the third page of the agenda packet. They're adding to their report the ballot items listed on the board. Those are all of the propositions on the Statewide ballot for the election on November 2, with a recommendation of yes or no. This is in addition to the three Resolutions the GA would consider that evening. He would ask if they could quickly go through each one and give a one-sentence summary. Ms. Sharma said she would enlist the help of Ms. Joshi.

Ms. Joshi said she wrote some Propositions on the Board. Prop. 1A, "Local Government Funds," and Prop. 65, "Local Government Funds," are in response to Gov. Schwarzenegger taking funds away from local

government and saying he'd give money back, but actually never doing so. Prop. 65 says the Governor must declare a fiscal emergency, which would be approved by a two-thirds vote of the Legislature, before money could be taken away from local government. That's what both Propositions do.

Prop. 59, "Public Records," is endorsed by the League of Women Voters, and would have all government meetings open and with public access.

Propositions 60 and 62 are direct opposites. Prop. 60, "Political Parties in Elections," was put on the ballot by the Legislature and maintains that California keep the closed primary system they currently have. Under this system, people can only vote in the Democrat or Republican primaries if they're a registered in those parties. Prop. 62, "Primary Elections," would have an open primary, and allow voters to vote for any candidate in a primary. The thing that External Affairs liked about this is that there's been a lot of gerrymandering in California, resulting in really strong Republican or Democrat districts. That means an election really takes place in the primary, and candidate, Democrat or Republican, will either not run against anyone or run against a really beat opponent, since the districts are so strongly weighted towards one party. Prop. 62 would make it so the top two vote getters in the primary, regardless of party affiliation, would be on the November ballot for State Assembly or Senate. People could also vote for any party in the presidential primary and others. They couldn't vote for both candidates.

Prop. 60-A, "Surplus Property," deals with property the State has that it wasn't using, and would allow the State to sell the property and use the proceeds to pay off bonds. Prop. 61, "Bonds for Children's

Officer Reports -- Ballot Propositions (cont'd)

- 5 -

Hospitals," would create a bond to build more children's hospitals and emergency rooms. Prop. 63, "Tax for Mental Health," is something Delegates will be asked to endorse, and is an area the GA worked on last year. It's a 1% tax on the top wealthiest 1% of the people in the State of California, to support mental health services for children, adults, and the elderly.

Prop. 64, "Lawsuits about Unfair Business Practices," would prevent private people from suing businesses unless they can prove that explicit harm has been done to them. The External Affairs Office is recommending a nay vote on this is because it's really meant to weaken environmental lawsuits that try to protect the environment. It would make it more difficult to prove explicit damage was done.

Delegates will be asked to endorse Prop. 66, "Changes to the 'Three Strikes' Law." California currently operates under the Three Strikes Law such that if one is convicted of three felonies, they're automatically mandated to get 25 years to life. Prop. 66 would require the second and third strikes to be for violent felonies. There are 4,000 people in California prisons because they may have bounced a \$200 check, or shoplifted a small item from a store, whatever it may be, and they're mandated to get 25 years to life. Prop. 66 would make it so the other strikes would have to be for violent crimes. It would save the State lots of money.

Ms. Joshi said Prop. 68, "Tax for Emergency Medical Services," was self-explanatory. Prop. 68, "Slot Machines," gambling expansion, would allow non-tribal casinos to open on non-reservation lands, and it involves contracting and is kind of technical. She couldn't really explain everything, but the gist is, it's bad.

Prop. 69, "DNA Sample Collection," deals with DNA sampling, and the California ACLU is opposed. Anybody arrested for a crime, whether or not they're charged or convicted, would have DNA samples taken and included in a California registry. Right now that only occurs if one is convicted. One is supposed to be innocent until proven guilty. And when there are arrests at protests, people's DNA would be taken, and would be accessible to the FBI.

Prop. 70, "Tribal Compacts," would create a 99-year-long contract for any State Indian groups that sign a compact with the Governor defining their gambling rights, and how much money would go to the State and how much to the casino. Most tribes endorse this Proposition. Prop. 71, "Bonds for Stem Cell Research," would create a bond to support stem cell research.

For Prop. 72, "Health Care Coverage," there's a Resolution in the agenda packet asking the Assembly to endorse it. The Proposition would require all companies with more than 200 full-time employees, to offer full benefits to employees. It's mainly targeted at big stores, like the big grocery or big box stores. For companies with more than 50 employees, this wouldn't start for another two years, when such businesses would have to do the same thing.

Mr. Sharma said the endorsements were part of a report that had to be approved. That meant that if the Assembly passes the report without amending it, they would adopt this platform. When the External Affairs Office and External Affairs Committee prepare a voters guide, as they're asking to do in the report, the guide would reflect these endorsements, or condemnations, by the GA. Delegates could move to amend it or move to strike any of the propositions under consideration, and treat this as an action item. The report was on the table and he would entertain a motion to approve it. It was so moved and seconded. Objections were raised. Mr. Sharma said they would enter into debate on the report.

Officer Reports -- Ballot Propositions (cont'd)

- 6 -

Ms. Franklin said most propositions she's heard about, but for some, all she heard about them is what she heard that evening. She didn't feel comfortable taking an official GA position she'd technically be behind since she's only heard one side of things, for about 20 seconds on each proposition. She wasn't comfortable adopting the propositions as something she had to stand behind.

Mr. Queuedo moved to amend the endorsement of Prop. 62. One reason districts are gerrymandered the way they were was to gain as many Democratic seats as possible in the Assembly. More than that, the geography, with Democrats on the coast and Republicans in the Central Valley and Northern California, makes it so an open primary would weaken the geographic distribution of where the votes are actually cast. Strong districts for the Republicans or the Democrats result from a lot of Republicans or Dems who support their candidates. In actuality, if there's any bias, it's toward the Democrats. So it's a Pandora's box.

Mr. Sharma said the amendment would amend the GA's recommendation on Prop. 62 to a no. Mr. Queuedo introduced himself and said he was from the Policy School. The motion to amend was seconded.

A Delegate said that as she understood it, for primaries in most states, voters are only able to vote in their

own party because otherwise they could vote for a weaker candidate in the other party, resulting in a weaker candidate to run against. Ms. Joshi said that could definitely happen. She wasn't an expert, but would guess the question was whether people thought that risk was worth it. Mr. Sharma said an open primary was different and would mean voters wouldn't be given a separate ballot that was based on their party. People could vote for any candidate, and the top two vote getters would be on the general election ballot. What was raised on the floor was a little different from a cross-over primary.

Mr. Daal moved to strike Prop. 62 from the list. The motion was seconded. Mr. Sharma called for debate on the amendment. Hearing no debate, he said they would go to a vote. **THE MOTION TO STRIKE PROPOSITION 62 FROM THE LIST OF BILLS TO BE ENDORSED PASSED BY -VOTE.**

Mr. Sharma said they were back to consideration of the main report.

Ms. Ahrendt said she had a request about Prop. 72, and about small businesses with about 50 employees that might not be able to afford giving health care to employees in two years. She asked if there was any provision to help those small businesses out. Mr. Sharma said that since Props. 63, 66, and 72 were coming up as Resolutions, they could move to strike them from the list of all the propositions. A motion was made to strike Props. 62, 63, and 72 from the list of propositions on the board. Mr. Sharma said the GA would deal with those as Resolutions.

Ms. Dugas said that regarding the question about Prop. 72 and small businesses, there was an option to join with other local businesses to create a group and get the benefits larger companies receive.

A Delegate asked what kind of property was involved with Prop. 60-A and what was being taxed in Prop. 67. Ms. Sharma said it's surplus property, and believed it was actual property. Mr. Sharma said that Prop. 60 and 60-A were a single initiative as drafted by the Legislature. The Senate would argue the Legislature put it there to defeat 62. The California court ruled there was a violation to have initiatives deal with one subject. So Props. 60 and 60-A were bifurcated. If the State had a junkyard in Richmond, it could sell that land.

Officer Reports -- Ballot Propositions (cont'd)

- 7 -

A Delegate said there was a rearrangement of the land around the Bay, with some land going for an airport, some for development, and the rest for environmental land. He was concerned that land could be sold that might otherwise be used for restoration, affordable housing, or something else in the future, and all they'd get out of it was maybe \$1 million, not a lot in this crisis. Mr. Garcia said the State sells this property whether or not the Proposition is passed. The Initiative only determines whether or not money gained from selling the property goes towards debt reduction, or if it could be used for anything. Mr. Schechtman asked where the money would go if the proposition was passed. Mr. Garcia said it would go towards debt reduction. The Delegate asked if the money could go to schools. Mr. Sharma said this was cross debate. He asked if anybody had an answer. Ms. Sharma said the money could potentially be redirected if the Legislature wanted it to go to schools, but she thought that was unlikely.

Mr. Sharma asked if there was a motion. Mr. Josh asked about Prop. 67, and what was being taxed. Ms.

Sharma said it's phone utility bill and is a minimal tax. Mr. Garcia said it would be \$1-2. Ms. Sharma said it would go to 911 emergency boards. Mr. Josh said and it's a tax that was across-the-board and was not progressive. Mr. Sharma asked people to please speak only when recognized by the Chair.

Mr. Daal asked about the position of indigenous peoples on Prop. 68. Ms. Sharma said they're against it. Mr. Sharma said Prop. 68 was funded by the gaming industry and race tracks, such as Golden Gate Fields. Prop. 70 was put on the ballot by, he believed, several tribes in Southern California.

Ms. Odusanya asked if the phone tax was for being online or for using cell phones. Ms. Sharma said she thought it was for land lines.

Lola Odusanya moved to strike the endorsements written on the board and to ask the External Affairs Committee to publicize this as recommendations of the External Affairs Committee of the GA. Mr. Sharma said he heard two parts to that motion: to strike the proposed endorsements written on the board and to allow the External Affairs Committee to advertise its own opinion, as a committee, rather than the GA as a whole. The motion was seconded.

Mr. Josh said he thought an endorsement would be more powerful coming from the GA.

Ms. Greene said the proposal to consider the positions on the board was to speak from a unified position. But if they can't, since there are motions to strike some measures from GA endorsement, and there are debates about specific propositions, the External Affairs Committee would be given leeway to advertise its positions. That way they can at least get the message out and educate the public, and help them make up their own minds.

Mr. Daal said he agreed on the issue of unity, and perhaps the GA should try to whittle the list down to a few they want to put the power of the GA's endorsement behind. He thought that would be helpful.

Ms. Sharma said that's what the GA will do with Propositions 63, 66, and 72, the three Propositions they think will more directly impact students. Those Propositions would have the GA's name behind them. The rest of the Propositions were different.

Mr. Sharma said the motion on the floor was to strike the proposed endorsements and attach a note to this that allows the External Affairs Committee to go forward. All debate should be germane to that motion.

Mr. Stang said he thought it was a good idea for the reason that Ms. Sharma mentioned.

Officer Reports -- Ballot Propositions (cont'd)

- 8 -

Ms. Greene said they have three Propositions proposed for GA endorsement, and the Assembly could sit and debate, if they wanted to whittle the list down, and be there all night. She would suggest that in the interests of time, it would be good to vote on this motion. She moved to call the question. The motion to end debate was seconded and failed by voice-vote.

A Delegate asked if it was possible to talk about the three Propositions that directly deal with grads, and have

them endorsed by the GA, and issue the others under the External Affairs Committee only. Mr. Sharma said that's what the motion would do.

Mr. Valleé said the issue that Mr. Daal brought up about having unity and power was very important. They want to know about any other proposition where someone has information the GA should know. He had information for one, Prop. 64, which was very important because it's a huge power discrepancy in terms of the money. Corporations are spending \$8 million trying to get it passed, versus \$250,000 by non-profits. That's something he'd want them to factor in. He asked if there was any other information he could provide so people would feel more comfortable taking a stand.

Mr. Daal said he had an idea, and would like it to be reflected the debate going on at the meeting, to allow the report the External Affairs Committee will issue to be on behalf of the GA, since it knows the issues they're talking about. Mr. Sharma said that was too vague and relied on the discretion of people like him, who shouldn't be trusted. So he would rule that out of order. He called for any other debate or amendments.

A motion was made to call the question. The motion to end debate was seconded and passed unanimously by voice-vote.

THE MOTION PASSED BY VOICE-VOTE, TO STRIKE THE LIST ON THE BOARD FROM THE REPORT AND ALLOW THE EXTERNAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, IN PREPARING ITS VOTER GUIDE, TO MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS UNDER THE AUTHORITY THAT IT HAS AS A COMMITTEE, NOT UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF THE GA.

Mr. Sharma said the writing on the board was struck and they were back to consideration of the report itself, which now only consisted of the ten lines on the bottom of the third page.

A motion to approve the report was made and seconded. Mr. Sharma called for any questions.

A Delegate male asked what percentage was needed for the GA to approve an endorsement. Mr. Sharma said it depends on the nature and substance of the motion. To amend any particular item would take a majority vote, to pass the report that takes a stand would take a two-thirds vote. The general rule is majority, and some motions need a two-thirds vote.

A Delegate asked if the voters guide will only list summaries about the propositions, or if there will be further information. Mr. Sharma said he believed that was the case. Ms. Sharma said there would be more information. She wasn't sure whether this will be e-mailed, but there will be more information than what's on the board, and it should include supporters as well.

Mr. Valleé asked if it was possible to make a request to have information about who is backing each side on these initiatives in the voters guide. Ms. Sharma said they would, and they'd have that.

Officer Reports -- Ballot Propositions (cont'd)

- 9 -

Mr. Sharma said that under the new fee policy, any voters guide would include pro and con, the affect of

measures on grads, and information on who to contact for further information.

Mr. Sharma called for any other debate or motions on the report, and hearing none, said they would go to a vote. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE EXTERNAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE REPORT PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.**

-
Mr. Sharma said they were back to the regular order of the agenda. Reporting as the GA Chair, Mr. Sharma said his report was in the back of the agenda packet. People have had lots of campus meetings and have done housekeeping stuff at the GA. The Vice Chancellor Search Committee, for the Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration, which is the division of the University that Auxiliary support services fall under. So they're very interested in hiring a person who will understand their needs as student government. The Student Fee Referendum Committee is discussing student fee policy and how the University goes about getting mandatory student fees from students, not the ones the Regents set, but the student-imposed student fees, such as the government fees that pay for the GA. He called for any questions on his report.

Mr. Sharma said he would add that since he wrote this, he's working now, in consultation with the Coalition for Diversity at Boalt, on issues related to admissions. The Dean of the Law School announced that he may push for a policy of legacy admissions at Boalt. Mr. Sharma said he was working with the Coalition for Diversity on that. Legacy admissions were not the right path for a public Law School.

A Delegate asked about his feeling about how the new Chancellor will respond to grad student interests. Mr. Sharma said he hasn't met officially with the new Chancellor. He met Chancellor Birgeneau informally at the announcement of his appointment. Mr. Sharma said it was his sense that the Chancellor was very receptive to grad student needs, and that he had a good relationship with grads at Toronto. So he would hope that would continue, particularly as many of the agenda items Mr. Sharma said he would take to the Chancellor coalesce with the University's own objectives, such as housing.

Mr. Sharma said Executive Reports are where the Assembly gets a chance to scrutinize what they're doing in Executive offices, and to direct Execs to do things where they're accountable to Delegates. It's Delegates' institutional opportunity to ensure that Executives were serving them.

A motion to approve the President's report was made and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE PRESIDENT'S REPORT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Reporting as Academic Affairs Vice President, Mr. Schechtman said he distributed fliers and would ask them to please take a look at it and hang them up in a space accessible to grads in their departments. One of his main responsibilities is getting grad student representation on campus committees, and a number of committees at that time are looking to meet that month, and are waiting for grad student representatives in order to do so. He also had a couple of copies of a brief blurb on committees, and he'd hand around a sign up list for Delegates, if they'd like him to send them an e-mail.

Mr. Schechtman said the Committee on Student Conduct is the hearing board that adjudicates anything from plagiarism to sit-ins at Wheeler Hall. Any violation of student conduct that does not get negotiated

Officer Reports (cont'd)

- 10 -

reaches this hearing board. They're short one grad student. This board is very high profile and can take a lot of time, and can meet as much as weekly, if there are cases. If there are no cases, it doesn't meet. Also, the Radiation Safety Committee is looking for two grad student representatives, one from life sciences and one from physical sciences. This would apply to Delegates who work with radioactive material in their lab or department. Hazardous Waste Management is looking for two students, if Delegates work with hazardous material. In addition, the Diving Control Board meets once a semester. The previous two committees also meet once a semester. The Diving Control Board looks at policies governing any diving-related activities, mostly in the biological sciences. The Course Materials Fee Committee is an important body and looks at mandatory student fees that they all pay that go towards course material, such as paper. There is a push to increase that fee this year. The Underhill Field and Parking Replacement Committee will basically deal with a construction project, and anyone who was interested in campus infrastructure, including transportation impacts of the Committee, might be interested. The Long-Range Development Plan is the architect for the campus over the next 15 years. The Lower Sproul Redevelopment Committee will consider the entire area of Lower Sproul Plaza, which is slated for redevelopment over the next 10 to 15 years. It includes tearing down a number of buildings, such as Eshleman Hall, which is seismically unsafe. This Committee will have two full days of brainstorming sessions with the consultant that month, to gather student requirements. Mr. Schechtman said he realized Lower Sproul was mostly undergrad space, but if grads are to make it more utilized by grads, this was the opportunity. For any of these committees, Delegates could volunteer to serve on them, as could people in their departments they know, or in student groups, who might be interested in using this space. The Life Safety and Seismic Safety Committee oversees a pot of about \$6 million, which is to be allocated for seismic and other life safety upgrades of student-related buildings. An example would be the fire system in Anthony Hall. He called for any questions.

Mr. Josh asked if Diving Control dealt with scuba diving. Mr. Schechtman said that was the case.

A Delegate asked where Underhill Field was located. Mr. Sharma said it is what is now the Underhill parking lot. It used to be a parking structure with a field on top. The campus is going to reconstruct the parking structure and put a field on top. It's on the corner of Channing and College, between Channing and Haste.

A Delegate asked if Student Conduct was to reform the Code of Conduct or to sit on the deliberative body. Mr. Schechtman said there is a separate committee to revise the Code of Conduct, which may or may not be convened. The Committee being discussed was actually the hearing board that hears cases. He would pass around a sheet if people were interested in serving on these committees. If they know someone who might be interested, he asked them to please let him know. He could also send out the descriptions of the committees. They need grad reps that month. This is an important way to influence campus policy, and a good way to get service experience for their résumé, as service is one of the three tiers of an academic life, along with teaching and research.

Mr. Schechtman said that in meeting with the Provost that month, they brought up concerns about the number of student fees that individual units on campus arbitrarily impose or increase. The Provost asked to have a list provided of all student fees, since it appears that no one in the Administration knows who is imposing fees on students. There are two types of fees. Mandatory fees include the Educational Fee, which is tuition, the Course Materials Fee, or the Student Activities Fee, which goes to the GA. The University is fully aware

of those fees, but is unaware of fees in individual units. He would ask Delegates to please think about any fee they've heard of or paid, in any unit, during their time at Berkeley. It's

Officer Reports (cont'd)

- 11 -

important to get as complete a list as possible. For example, the Library charges \$100 if they lose book. That fee might be fair, but it's a fee. They also charge a separate fee of \$10 to put that \$100 fee on CARS. No-interest emergency bridge loans from the University used to be free, and there is now a \$12-fee for that loan. A locker at the RSF costs \$10 a semester. These are the types of fees they need to document. He's heard that some schools charge a diploma fee. He would ask them to please be thorough.

Ms. Ahrendt asked if he was looking for University-imposed fees or things like prescriptions for health care or things like course readers, since for many classes they have to make their own. Mr. Schechtman said there was a fine line. Copying course materials wasn't a fee per se, but co-pays on insurance are a fee. If people make this as broad and inclusive as possible, the GA could make a determination before giving the list to the Provost.

Mr. Daal asked if he'd like to know if fees have gone up, since getting keys in his department used to be \$20 and now costs \$40. Mr. Schechtman said that was a great example. He asked if it was a fee or a deposit. Mr. Daal said he believed it was a fee. Mr. Schechtman said information about increases was important, because part of the policy the GA is pushing is that no unit would be able to impose or increase a fee unless there's a waiver for needy students and unless it can be demonstrated by customer service feedback that the service being provided was useful to grads and was a quality service.

Mr. Smith asked if parking fees should be included. Mr. Schechtman said they should be, and any fees for use of University services should be included.

Ms. Zahrt said the graduation gown is \$800 for Ph.D. students. Mr. Schechtman said that in such a case, they're actually paying for an item, such as a book. That could be added and they'd whittle the list down later. He was meeting with the Provost the third week of October, and if they come up with anything else, he would ask them to please send him an e-mail.

Ms. Greene asked when the Student Conduct Committee meets. Mr. Schechtman said it will have training next Friday. It generally meets Wednesday afternoons and, at in the evenings; and sometimes late into the evening.

Mr. Sharma called for any other questions and hearing none, said he would entertain a motion to approve. It was so moved and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS VICE PRESIDENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Reporting as the External Affairs Vice President, Ms. Medina said the report was included in the packet. She wanted to mention that last year, the Cal State Student Association wrote a bill that would cap fee increases at 8%. They got a legislator to sponsor it, although it was vetoed by the Governor. The UCSA is also able to

do that. So if students have policy ideas, they could bring them to her or the External Affairs Committee, to pass on to the UCSA. She yielded time to Wanda Hasadri.

Ms. Hasadri introduced herself and said she was the Campus Organizing Director in the External Affairs office. They're currently doing voter registration for students on campus, in coordination with the ASUC. There's about a week and a half left to register. Students move a lot, and they have to register to vote every time they move. They'll table around campus, with the ASUC, and she'd pass around sign-up sheets if people were interested in helping out. They definitely need volunteers.

Officer Reports (cont'd)

- 12 -

A motion to approve the report was made and seconded. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE EXTERNAL AFFAIRS VICE PRESIDENT PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Board and Committee Reports

Report from the Executive Board

Mr. Sharma said the report was on page 3 of the packet. The Executive Board delayed applications for the Social Development Grant until next semester. There was only one applicant, who identified another grant funding source. They should have administrative difficulties resolved by next semester. He called for any questions about the Board's report. A motion to approve was made and seconded. THE REPORT FROM THE EXECUTIVE BOARD WAS APPROVED WITH NO OBJECTION.

Begin written report from the Executive Board

Executive Board Report, 5 October 2004

The Executive Board has met twice since the last Delegates meeting: Thursday, September 16th and Thursday, September 30th.

The members of the Executive Board are: S. Nzingha Dugas (GA Manager), David Garcia (Chemistry), Trevor Lanting (Physics), Claudia Medina (Law), Cintya Molina (African American Studies), Lola Odusanya (Chemical Engineering), Romola Sanyal (Architecture), Robert Schechtman (German), Rishi N. Sharma (Law), and Jay Stagi (City and Regional Planning). Members serve by virtue of their official position in the Graduate Assembly.

The purpose of the Executive Board is to coordinate the advocacy side of the Graduate Assembly between the three Executive Officers, the three standing committees, and the representatives to the Graduate Council.

The Executive Board took the following actions in addition to the general coordination and planning assigned to the Board by the By-laws:

Social Development Grant

In light of the administrative infeasibility of the Social Development Grant, approved by the Delegates at the last meeting, the Executive Board agreed to suspend the grant program for the current grants cycle (Round 2). In lieu of payment from the grant, the Graduate Social Club -- the only group that applied -- will receive \$2,000 from their Graduate Assembly trustee account.

Graduate Assembly Obligations

The Executive Board also discussed ongoing alleged obligations of the Graduate Assembly to the ASUC Auxiliary for final payment of the solar panels atop the MLK Jr. Student Union Building and the ASUC Government for elections costs over the last two academic years.

End written report from the Executive Board

Report from the Academic Affairs Committee

- 13 -

Committee Reports

Report from the Academic Affairs Committee

Mr. Schechtman said he chaired the Academic Affairs Committee of GA Delegates interested in policy issues regarding Berkeley's Administration or faculty. It has a broad mandate. They're interested in increasing affordable housing and also have business related to grad student mental health, the calendar, and fees. The Committee met last Thursday, along with the mental health group that was spun off as a separate student group. They did not have quorum, so he was going to hand around a sign-up sheet for this Committee. All Delegates are asked to be on one committee, and if they would like to serve on this body, to deal with policy issues on campus, he would ask them to add their name. They'll next meet on Wednesday, October 13, at 5 p.m., in Anthony Hall. Priorities that year will be housing and potential diversity issues, and they'll also consider, if people were interested, in the initiatives, including mentoring with faculty, grad-to-grad, and grad/undergrad. He yielded time.

A Delegate said they have an Affirmative Action Committee. If people are interested, they should add their name. They'll meet next Wednesday at 5 p.m.

A motion to accept the report was made and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.**

Report from the Finance Committee

Mr. Garcia said the Finance Committee met twice in the last month. One was an orientation to familiarize

members with the budget and to meet on the fiscal close from last year. The numbers came in. Last year, when the GA did the budget, the Finance Committee formulated, and the Delegates approved, a guideline or priority list for dealing with any carry forward revenue that might accrue. The first was to rebuild GA reserves. Last year, to balance the budget, rather than completely slash some projects, they dipped into the GA reserves, \$50,000, for programs to remain funded. The Fi-Comm decided to refill those to \$50,000. It's a back-up fund in case something catastrophic happened, and would allow the GA to still have enough money to keep its doors open for six months, including paying salaries and infrastructure. Second, for unspent student group rollover, they tend to have quite a large carry over from the prior year. The Finance Committee wanted the GMSP and GWP to be refunded. Regarding UCSA dues, that was not important any more because the Executive Board took care of it over the summer. The Business Office was granted an increase, money was left available for mentoring projects, and they also dealt with solar panels. Once the Finance Committee started doing this, they went straight along with what the Delegates decided last year. They had GA reserves at \$50,000. Unspent student group rollover totals \$169,180.10. This new total is an increase over \$10,000 from last year, and considering the fact that the entire GA budget has gone down by, he believed, \$50-75,000, that was pretty impressive, since everything else took substantial cuts. So they're proud of that. No requests were presented by the GMSP or the GWP because the timeline was so rapid. The Committee knows that Delegates wanted them to fund these projects so they'll keep some money available for these projects' requests in the coming months. They simply won't spend it all now. The Business Office and the Empowering Women of Color Conference

Report from the Finance Committee (cont'd)

- 14 -

presented a proposal for money for general conference expenses, additional staff hours, printing costs, and Web support positions, which totaled \$11,312.50, and the Finance Committee approved the requests as is, pending actual justification is submitted, since they only gave them what the items cost, and the Finance Committee wanted to see a justification for these expenses. So they approved them, and the allocations can be spent, but a report must be turned in to the Finance Committee for verification that they're actually using the money as they said they would. If they do, no harm, no foul, and they can keep the money. Again, there was no request for money based on mentoring, but they'll keep money available for that. The Finance Committee decided to not allocate money to solar panels. The reasons were listed in item number 7. People could ask questions at the end of the report.

For number 8, they have to pay for ASUC elections. Last year, when the GA did the budget process, ASUC elections were left out of the budget. The Executive Board took money they had to play with and put it into ASUC elections. The Finance Committee refunded them up to their expected contribution, which is roughly \$16,500. The remaining money was put into a Capital Expenses general line item. He called for any questions.

Ms. Zahrt asked about the capital expenses. Mr. Garcia said they don't know what sort of projects may come to them later with requests for money, and they need to make sure that money was available.

Ms. Mashiyama asked if the GA didn't previously agree to finance some of the solar panels, and asked what the controversy was. Mr. Sharma said the ASUC, of which they're all members, operates Eshleman Hall and the MLK Student Union. On top of the Student Union are solar panels that cost a total of \$450,000 to put in.

Four years ago, the President of the GA at the time said the GA would pony up with \$150,000. The ASUC would contribute another \$150K, and the ASUC Auxiliary would fund the remaining \$150K. In the budget development process last year, there were insufficient funds for the GA to allocate \$50,000, which is what normally happened. Normally, they made that allocation out of their surplus. They're not contractually obligated to pay for the solar panels, and their budget has shrunk since the solar panels were installed. So it was a problem with money. They can take \$50,000 and defund the project, and at this point they're looking for money to give the Auxiliary \$50,000. Ms. Mashiyama asked who was paying for the solar panels, then. Mr. Sharma said they've already been paid for by someone. Ms. Mashiyama asked if something bad would happen if the GA didn't pay. Mr. Sharma said the Auxiliary fronted the money with the idea that it would be reimbursed. The solar panels have been installed and are a good idea. Ms. Mashiyama asked if they'd get into trouble if they don't pay. Mr. Sharma said he didn't think so. They can't be sued, if that's what she was asking. Ms. Mashiyama asked if the Auxiliary could withhold other monies, like they threatened to do last year. Mr. Sharma said they could try, but they'd have a bigger problem on their hands than they thought they would.

Mr. Schechtman said the solar panels sit on a student union building and was therefore a good cause, obviously. But the financial benefit of reducing electricity bills does not accrue to the GA. So the GA is paying for it, and the Auxiliary is getting the benefit. Mr. Sharma said the ASUC also benefits, from the Auxiliary. Mr. Garcia said that benefit, however, does not fall to the GA. Mr. Sharma said the way their finances work, the GA is guaranteed every penny that every grad pays to the Student Activities Fee. So they recoup that money. There's nothing set as to who gets commercial revenue, or how much they get. Last year, e.g., the Auxiliary had a profit of \$103,000. Under the agreement that governs this, that money is automatically allocated to the ASUC, for allocation. The GA never sees a penny of it. So when the Auxiliary saves \$18,000 a year on electricity costs, that lowers its overhead, which means more profit for the ASUC. The GA gets none of that money. Without going into detail, he'd say that this is all currently the subject of ongoing negotiations between the GA, the Auxiliary, and the ASUC.

Report from the Finance Committee (cont'd)

- 15 -

Ms. Mashiyama said that it sounds like the GA wouldn't be sued if they don't pay, but whether or not they have a contractual obligation to pay, it seemed that if the GA did agree to pay, it would behoove them to do so. It would look bad if they didn't pay, if they could. Mr. Sharma said he didn't think the issue was so much the obligation as financing, because when the agreement was made, the GA had an annual budget of probably close to \$800,000. They now have an annual budget of closer to \$500,000. So the Finance Committee last year made a tactical decision to fund ongoing projects and leave this question for a potential surplus, rather than paying it upfront. Surplus figures added up to are \$38,786, not \$50,000.

Ms. Ahrendt moved to approve the Finance Committee vote. The motion was seconded. Mr. Sharma said that if people had questions, they could object to a vote at that time. An objection was raised.

Ms. J. Franklin asked if naming rights was really an issue. Mr. Sharma said it was. Mr. Garcia said it's a big issue. Mr. Sharma said the Director of Sustainability of the ASUC has proposed naming the solar panels after a campus figure. Over the violent objections of the GA President, they have backed down. That's the state of the current naming prospects

Mr. Sharma said that if there was no further debate, the question would go to an immediate vote. THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

Begin written report from the Finance Committee Chair

Finance Committee Report
Delegates Meeting: Thursday, October 7, 2004

Presented by David E. Garcia, Finance Committee Chair

Numbers for fiscal close came in during the last month. Last year during the budget process the Delegates approved a guideline by which fiscal close budget adjustment was to occur. Briefly, this guideline (the "priority list") is as follows:

1. GA Reserves to be refilled to \$50,000
2. Unspent student group funding rolls over
3. GMSP/GWP
4. UCSA
5. Business Office
6. Mentoring
7. Solar Panels

The Carryforward that the committee had for allocation totaled \$117,278.96.

In line with these priorities, the Finance Committee unanimously decided the following:

1. An additional \$20,000 was added to the GA Reserves. The line item total is \$50,000.
2. The remaining unspent student group funding was rolled over. The new total for this line item is \$169,180.10. This is an increase of roughly \$10,000 from last year.

Report from the Finance Committee (cont'd)

- 16 -

Written report from the Finance Committee Chair (cont'd)

3. No requests for money were presented by GMSP or GWP due to short notice so they received no additional funding. It was understood by the Finance Committee that it was the will of the Delegates that money be left available for these projects.
4. The Executive Board accounted for the UCSA dues over the summer so this item is no longer relevant.
5. The Business Office and the EWOC (a joint venture of GWP and GMSP) presented a proposal for funds

including Web support positions, general conference expenses, additional staff hours, and printing costs. These expenses totaled \$11,312.50 and were approved, pending a justification is submitted to the committee for approval by the next regularly scheduled meeting (October 25, 2004).

6. No requests for money were presented to the committee on the basis of mentoring. It is understood by the Finance Committee that it was the will of the delegates that money be left available for mentoring projects.
7. The Finance Committee decided that no money would be allocated to solar panels at this time, although at such a time as the GA's partial ownership of the solar panels and the accompanying claim to the partial share of benefits that accrue from them is recognized, the Finance Committee is open to negotiation of a fair and reasonable settlement for the remaining cost. Should the Auxiliary or the Executive Board present to the Finance Committee a cost/benefit analysis of paying the remaining \$50,000 desired by the Auxiliary, the Finance Committee will be more than willing to reconsider this voluntary payment. The Finance Committee also decided that Auxiliary and the Executive Board should work up an actual contract or Memorandum of Understanding that includes a reasonable payment plan (e.g., \$10,000 a year for the next five years) and solidifies our benefits from paying for the solar panels (e.g., naming rights, commercial revenue, a partial share of their benefits, etc.)
8. Per our Charter and By-laws the GA must pay for a portion of ASUC elections. The Finance Committee increased this line item to \$16,500 to meet our expected contribution. However, the Finance Committee did this with reservation. It is unfair that the GA is expected to pay for elections without any input to elections policy and cost, and it is the feeling of the Committee that the GA should have strong input and actual control over the cost of the elections if we are to continue paying for them. The willingness of the Committee to pay for elections in the future hinges on structural changes occurring within the ASUC so that the elections policy and budget, and any changes to the policy and budget, require an approval from the GA. It is the request of the Finance Committee, with the approval of the Delegates, that the information contained within this item (i.e., item 8), is communicated to the appropriate entities within the ASUC (e.g., the Elections Council, the Senate, any Executives, etc.).
9. The remaining \$38,786.36 was placed into a Capital Expenses general line item.

End written report from the Finance Committee Chair

Report from the Funding Committee

Report from the Funding Committee

- 17 -

Ms. Zahrt said that Mr. Lanting couldn't be there, so at the last Funding Committee meeting, she was Co-Chair, to report at this meeting. If people have any questions, they could send Mr. Lanting an e-mail, or ask them at that time. The recommended funding allocations were included in the agenda packet. This is round 2 of Grad Events. Grad Events funds special one-time events or ongoing events, such as a lecture series or symposia. Projects and Services funds administrative costs of groups, like offices or office space, and there

are several categories of grants. The Diversity Grant funds programs designed to increase diversity or engage in dialogue in diversity, and the Community Service Grant was self-explanatory. Other grants include the Educational Improvement Grants Project and the Student Activism Grant. The Funding Committee's recommendations for allocations, based on GA By-laws, were included in the agenda packet. She called for any questions about the allocations or the process.

A motion to approve the Funding Committee's report was made and seconded. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE REPORT FROM THE FUNDING COMMITTEE PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION, APPROVING ROUND 2 OF GRAD EVENTS, ROUND 1 OF GRANTS, AND ROUND 1 OF PROJECTS AND SERVICES.**

Report from the GA's Graduate Council Representatives

Ms. Odusanya said the Graduate Council met for the first time last month and the GA reps met the professors. However, the meeting was closed, so they'll review what they talk about in future meetings. They have a Grad Council meeting coming up soon, so if Delegates have pressing concerns they'd like reps to take to the Grad Division, they should let them know.

Mr. Sharma said that maybe she could remind the GA what things they're talking about as important items. Ms. Odusanya said they deal with the general agenda items of the GA, such as housing, mentoring, budget transparency, and faculty diversity.

Report from the ASUC Representative

Reporting as the ASUC representative, Ms. Sridaran introduced herself and said she's a Cal-SERVE Senator in the ASUC Senate. The ASUC Senate was a mess, compared to the GA, and she couldn't believe the GA's Chair doesn't need a gavel. They were at a recent meeting until 3:30 a.m. Mr. Sharma said the ASUC Senate doesn't serve dinner, either. Ms. Sridaran said she wanted to thank grads for getting her elected, because she counted on grads a lot for support last year, which is why she was the ASUC rep to the GA.

Ms. Sridaran said that one issue she wanted to prioritize was grad student autonomy, so the GA wasn't under the ASUC any more, since that causes a lot of provocations with funding. That's something she talked about last year with Catherine Ahn. Ms. Sridaran said she hoped to work with the GA that year.

Ms. Levitan said that last month the President came and spoke of being in favor of autonomy, and she was under the impression last year that he signed the autonomy pledge. So what he said last year was sincere. Ms. Sridaran said she's on the opposite party as the ASUC President that year, and the President

Report from the ASUC Representative (cont'd)

- 18 -

has a tendency to do that. He's co-opted some issues that her party has supported for a long time. Autonomy is something that Cal-SERVE, in general, definitely supports. She was sure the President supports it, because it would be beneficial for him to do that. But she wasn't sure how actively he'll work towards that end.

A Delegate asked if there was anything the GA or Delegates could do for grad autonomy that they weren't doing. The GA hasn't been doing much on it lately because it's such a touchy issue. Ms. Sridaran asked if there was an Autonomy Committee. Mr. Sharma said there was. Ms. Sridaran said they could meet and strategize, and start early, so it doesn't become an election issue.

Mr. Daal asked if GA autonomy has come up at ASUC meetings. Ms. Sridaran said it hasn't.

A Delegate asked what it would take to legally separate. Mr. Sharma said Article V of the ASUC Constitution sets up the GA and gives us the ASUC an ambiguous place in the GA's structure. A Delegate asked if that meant the ASUC had to vote on autonomy. Mr. Sharma said that last year the Autonomy Committee worked to get a referendum on last year's ASUC ballot, but the ASUC at the time would not certify it. But it was certified after the election, so the referendum will be on the ballot in the upcoming ASUC election. It would amend the ASUC Constitution to strip the GA out of the ASUC and make it a separate organization entirely. It had to be approved by a majority of voters on the campus. He asked what voter turnout usually is. Ms. Sridaran said it's usually 10%. Mr. Sharma said there are 9,000 grad students, and usually, a total of 3,000 students vote.

Mr. Daal asked what percentage of grads usually vote. Mr. Sharma said 11% of those who vote are grads. Grads are 29% of the student population, and the ASUC wants the GA to pay one-third of the costs for the election process.

A Delegate said he thought Chancellor Berdahl made some decisions on this. Mr. Sharma said that under University policy, the Chancellor has to recognize the GA as a student government, and the sense they got from him last year was that the first step would be resolving the student side of the problem, and the second part would be to get an official recommendation. The Delegate asked if there was any sense on how the new Chancellor feels. Mr. Sharma said it's his sense that once they're stripped away from the ASUC, they'd be separate. The GA has always spoken for grads.

Ms. Sridaran asked when the Autonomy Committee meets. Mr. Sharma said he didn't believe it's met yet.

Mr. Sharma said the Senate meets in that room every Wednesday starting at 7 p.m., and people can feel free to attend. If Delegates have anything they'd like to let the Senate know, they should let him or Ms. Sridaran know.

Mr. Smith asked if a benefits analysis, e.g., has been done on autonomy. Mr. Sharma said he didn't know if there was an objective report, but thought the deep sentiment has long been that the GA needs to get away from the ASUC as quickly as possible. While they always keep an open mind, the presumption has not shifted. Mr. Smith asked if there were any benefits. At other schools, e.g., grads don't ride buses for free because the undergrads provide funding for that. Mr. Sharma said they've looked at that. The GA at UCLA is totally separate, and grads have lost money because they won't vote to increase their budget. At Berkeley they're tied to the undergrads, who can vote to increase student contributions. The GA has seen the benefits of that, so there are definitely pros and cons, and the GA is aware of them, even if they haven't done a full analysis. But the general presumption has been that they gain far more than they lose.

Report from the ASUC Representative (cont'd)

- 19 -

Mr. Schechtman said that structurally, the issue was very easy, but becomes more complicated when allocating money and space. They're using an undergrad, ASUC room for their meeting, for free, and they would not automatically be able to have that right if they were independent of the ASUC. It's those tries of disentanglement issues that get complicated.

Mr. Stang asked if there was a way to find out more about this. Mr. Sharma said the Chair of the Autonomy Committee, Ms. Hwa, has files. They've been trying to set up a meeting. When one is scheduled, a notice will be sent out. If people have questions, he could forward them to Ms. Hwa, or do research.

A Delegate said he was willing to head this up, if nobody objected, and send out an e-mail for interested people, and try to find a meeting time. He thought a lot of people were interested. Mr. Sharma said that Ms. Hwa was Chair, and he'd like to give her a try. The Delegate asked if it was possible to put Ms. Ahn's presentation on the Web site. Mr. Sharma said he believed it was, and they'd see about that. Ms. Ahn chaired the Autonomy Committee last year and did a lot of work on this. He called for any other questions.

Report from the Store Operations Board

Mr. Sharma said the ASUC got \$103,000 in commercial profit, and the GA got nothing. The next SOB meeting is next Tuesday. If people were interested in attending, they should let him know. The meetings are interesting.

NEW BUSINESS

Election of the Organization and Rules Committee Chair

Mr. Sharma said he would open the floor to nominations. This Committee deals with the GA's By-laws and Constitution.

Mr. Daniels nominated himself. Mr. Sharma said the Chair of this Committee is also a member of the Executive Board, which meets twice a month. He called for any other nominations. A motion to close nominations was made and seconded and passed with no objection.

A Delegate asked how many Law students would be on the Board. Mr. Sharma said there would be three Law students on the Exec. Board, out of ten members.

Mr. Sharma said he didn't believe this Committee has had a quorum for a decade. It would deal with proposed changes in the By-laws. Mr. Schechtman said that being under the ASUC, the GA doesn't have a Constitution of its own. The GA's By-laws are poorly written and hard to interpret. If they're seriously

considering autonomy, they'd need to draft a Constitution, which would be a lot of work. Mr. Garcia said they need people to commit to that work.

Election of the Organization and Rules Committee Chair (cont'd)

- 20

Mr. Sharma asked Mr. Daniels to leave the room for a discussion and a vote. A discussion was held off the record. Mr. Sharma asked people to close their eyes for a secret vote. **THE MOTION TO APPROVE JOSH DANIELS AS CHAIR OF THE ORGANIZATION AND RULES COMMITTEE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY HAND-VOTE.** Mr. Sharma asked to have Mr. Daniels returned, and said he wanted to congratulate him. (Applause)

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. Sharma said they would recess for three minutes so people could read the Resolutions under consider. This meeting was recessed.

Back in session, Mr. Daal moved to consider the Resolutions under one vote. The motion was seconded and passed with no objection. Mr. Sharma said the Graduate Assembly would consider in one vote the Resolutions In Support of Prop. 63, In Support of Prop. 66, and In Support of Prop. 72.

The following Resolution was authored by Anu Joshi, Legislative Liaison, and was sponsored by the External Affairs Committee:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION 63

WHEREAS, Proposition 63 will impose an additional one percent (1%) tax on the richest one percent (1 %) of Californians; and

WHEREAS, the proceeds of Proposition 63 would provide funds to counties and cities that are public mental health jurisdictions to expand services and develop innovative programs and integrated service plans for mentally ill children, adults and seniors; and

WHEREAS, mental health services in the State of California are severely lacking the funding they need to be effective and helpful; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 63 would require the State of California to develop mental health service programs including prevention, early intervention, education, and training programs; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 63 would create a new commission to approve expenditures to public mental health

programs; and

WHEREAS, current funding levels for mental health programs will not be reduced because of the new income tax; and

WHEREAS, national studies have shown that depression among college students is on the rise;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly endorse Proposition 63.

Resolutions (cont'd)

- 21 -

The following Resolution was authored by Anu Joshi, Legislative Liaison and Luisa Leija, Executive Assistant, and was sponsored by the External Affairs Committee:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION 66

WHEREAS, Proposition 66 reforms California's three strikes sentencing law to require that a third strike (carrying a mandatory 25-to-life sentence) be a violent or serious felony; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 66 also changes the list of crimes counting as "strikes" to exclude some nonviolent or non-serious crimes; and

WHEREAS, re-sentencing would be an option for only some third strikers; and

WHEREAS, the Rand Corporation estimates that if money were spent for college graduation incentives rather than prisons for high-risk youth, crime would be reduced 3 to 4 times; and

WHEREAS, only one public university or college has been built and opened since 1984, but 21 prisons have been built in the same time period; and

WHEREAS, the public higher education budget has been cut four years in a row; and

WHEREAS, the Northern and Southern branches of the California ACLU, the CA AFL-CIO, the CA NAACP, the University of California Students Association and many other respected organizations have endorsed this proposition;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly endorses Proposition 66.

The following Resolution was authored by Anu Joshi, Legislative Liaison, and Luisa Leija, Executive Assistant, and was sponsored by the External Affairs Committee:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION 72

WHEREAS, Proposition 72, a measure on the November 2004 general election ballot, will guarantee health coverage to many of the 1.3 million Californians who do not currently have health insurance; and

WHEREAS, California taxpayers pay \$4.6 billion annually to cover emergency room and other health care bills for the uninsured; and

WHEREAS, extending health insurance to almost all working Californians will inevitably save tax dollars and relieve the burden on local emergency rooms; and

WHEREAS, the money saved by Proposition 72 can be used to pay for under-funded public higher education programs; and

Resolutions (cont'd)

- 22 -

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION 72 (cont'd)

WHEREAS, Proposition 72 will allow students who work full-time to receive health insurance through their employer rather than University Health Services; and

WHEREAS, Proposition 72 will allow students whose spouse, domestic partner, or parent(s) work full-time to receive health insurance through their spouse, domestic partner, or parent(s)'s employer rather than University Health Services; and

WHEREAS, access to quality health care is essential to all graduate students; and

WHEREAS, access to higher education and access to health care are fundamental human rights recognized and endorsed by the Graduate Assembly; and

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly endorses Proposition 72.

A Delegate said the second part of the Resolution on Prop. 66 says that they'll change to exclude some non-violent crimes from being a strike, and asked what crimes those were. Ms. Medina said they would include burglary and drugs. She didn't have the complete list.

Mr. Valleé moved to amend, to add an additional Resolution, In Opposition to Prop. 64.

The following Resolution was authored by Mr. Valleé:

RESOLUTION IN OPPOSITION TO PROP. 64

WHEREAS, Prop. 64, a measure on the November general election ballot, would prevent environmental groups from bringing actions using the law that protects Californians against unfair, unlawful, and illegal business practices; and

WHEREAS, Prop. 64 is opposed by the American Lung Association of California, the AARP, the Sierra Club, the California Consumers Union, the California Nurses Association, and every major environmental organization in California; and

WHEREAS, Prop. 64's biggest contributors are car dealers and large corporations, like Exxon, Mobil, General Motors, British Petroleum/ARCO, Clorox, and Southern California Edison; and

WHEREAS, the current unfair competition law has been a very effective too in combating fraudulent business practices and has been used by a wide range of environmental organizations in the decades that it has been in effect; and

WHEREAS, the ballot measure would block any action that didn't involve both a personal injury, financial, or property loss, which means that actions brought under the law involving the loss of clean air and water, clear cutting of pristine forests, and destruction of the coast, would be barred; and

Resolutions (cont'd)

- 23 -

RESOLUTION IN OPPOSITION TO PROP. 64 (cont'd)

WHEREAS, Prop. 64, if passed, would block groups like Communities for a Better Environment from protecting the public health as it did when it forced the big oil companies to clean up their massive contamination of California's drinking water sources with the cancer-causing gasoline additive, MTBE; and

WHEREAS, Prop. 64 would eliminate much of what is good about the unfair competition law, while letting polluters and other corporate outlaws escape accountability for their bad actions; and

WHEREAS, the need for clean air, clean water, and a protected environment is not only pertinent to the public good, but to the quality of life of all graduate students;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Graduate Assembly opposes Proposition 64.

Ms. Greene said she thought the Resolution was well-written and made the right point, but the other Resolutions were more directly linked to grad-student issues. She asked how he would link Prop. 64 specifically to grads. Mr. Valleé said it involves public health, clean water, and clean air, and it affects grads when things are put into the environment, such as MTBE. Ms. Greene asked if he would be opposed to adding another Whereas Clause, linking it more explicitly. Mr. Valleé asked if she had text. Ms. Greene suggested,

"Whereas, not only the health of the public, but the health and welfare of grad students is pertinent to this issue;"

Mr. Valleé said he would accept that as a friendly amendment.

A Delegate asked what impact this would have in the Bay Area. Mr. Valleé said he has a friend, a staff scientist, who works for the Environmental Law Foundation, an organization that brings lawsuits against corporations who try to get away with polluting activities, and this is the law the Foundation uses to bring companies to justice. In terms of impact, he didn't know that, but there could be a cut in the number of lawsuits against big corporations the Foundation could pursue, by 70%. As another note, corporations were spending \$8 million to get Prop. 64 passed, and environmental groups were spending \$250,000 against it.

A Delegate said the Proposition would amend the law that determines the necessary standing to sue and would require a plaintiff to be personally harmed in order to bring suit.

A Delegate asked if the only purpose of the amendment was to protect big businesses from lawsuits, and asked about the purpose of the Proposition. Mr. Sharma said some would say the purpose was to unclog the courts from frivolous lawsuits, and others would say those who have been most damaged by the law want to get rid of it.

Ms. Medina said bad attorneys would send a business a letter saying they're going to sue, as representatives of a party, and force businesses to settle, since it's much more expensive to fight a suit. But they have to weigh things out. With passage, environmental groups couldn't sue big companies doing bad stuff.

Resolutions (cont'd)

- 24 -

Mr. Sharma said an example of the use of the statute affected by Prop. 64 is a suit against Nike for advertising the use of particular manufacturing methods, but using sweatshops.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE ABOVE AMENDMENT TO THE PROP. 64 RESOLUTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDMENT TO ADD THE PROP. 64 RESOLUTION TO THE VOTE PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE.

A Delegate said that for Prop. 72, the implications in the fifth, sixth, and seventh Whereas Clauses was that SHIP is inadequate and wasn't quality health care. Mr. Sharma said he didn't think that was the intention.

A Delegate moved to strike, in the Prop. 72 resolution, the word "quality" from the seventh Whereas Clause, to read, "Whereas, access to health care is essential to all graduate students."

The Delegate said without the amendment, it sounded like SHIP was a bad deal.

A Delegate moved to strike the seventh Whereas Clause from the Prop. 72 Resolution: "Whereas, access to quality health care is essential to all graduate students." The motion was seconded.

Mr. Stang asked about the intent in making reference to University Health Services. Mr. Sharma said he thought the intent was that student health insurance would be unloaded because students on SHIP would still have access to University Health Services, but wouldn't use it as much, since they'd have another doctor. Mr. Stang said that just pertained to students who work full-time.

Mr. Sharma said there was a motion to strike the seventh Whereas Clause. The motion to amend failed by voice-vote.

Ms. Ahrendt moved to strike "rather than the University Health Services" in the fifth and six Whereas Clauses. The motion was seconded. THE MOTION TO AMEND THE PROP. 72 RESOLUTION PASSED WITH NO OBJECTION.

THE MOTION TO APPROVE THE RESOLUTIONS PASSED UNANIMOUSLY BY VOICE-VOTE: RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION 63; RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION 66; RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSITION 72, AS AMENDED; AND RESOLUTION IN OPPOSITION TO PROP. 64, AS AMENDED.

Mr. Sharma said that concluded their agenda.

Mr. Cantor asked people to please return their name tags.

This meeting adjourned at 7:43 p.m.

These minutes respectfully submitted by,

Steven I. Litwak
Recording Secretary

- 25 -

Present at the GA meeting of October 7, 2004

German, Robert Schechtman
Architecture, Romi Sanyal
Chemistry, David Garcia
Architecture, Aditi Rao
Chemistry, Lynn Trahey
Comparative Literature, Amelia Borrego
Economics, Andrew Hayashi
Education, Ronald Cruz
ESPM, Josh Fisher
Folklore, Anthony Buccitelli
German, Jenn Zahrt
History of Art, Elizabeth Quarles
Italian Studies, Marisa Escobar

Law, Rishi Sharma
Chemical Engineering, Lola Odusanya
African Diaspora Studies, Zoe Franklin
Bioengineering, Matt Eckerle
Classics, Nandini Pandey
East Asian Languages&Cult, Patrick Noonan
Economics, Kevin Stange
ESPM, Ainsley Seago
Ethnic Studies, Dorothy Nason
Geography, Jason Strange
History, Candace Chen
Information Mgmt.& Systems, Bruce Rinehart
Law, C'Reda Weeden

Law, Deepika Sharma
 Law, Joshua Daniels
 Law, Patrick Hein
 Law, Bryant Yang
 Logic & the Methodology of Science, Johanna Franklin
 Mechanical Engineering, Eugenio Urquiza
 Music, Rebekah Ahrendt
 Philosophy, Jeffrey Wolf
 Plant and Microbial Biology, Jon Penterman
 Public Policy, Bryan Queuedo
 Social Welfare, Maayan Greene
 Social Welfare, Lawrence Smith
 Bioengineering, Carmel Levitan
 Integrative Biology, Christine Petersen
 Sociology, Manuel Valleé
 Staff- Dept. Liaison Chris Cantor

Law, Hollie Sawyers
 Law, Maximo Fuentes
 Law, Yael Livny
 Linguistics, Christian Dicanio
 MCB, Susan Mashiyama
 Mechanical Engineering, Jessica Preciado
 Performance Studies, Jessica Holt
 Physics, Miguel Daal
 Political Science, Darius Omston
 Rhetoric, J. Bradley Rogers
 Social Welfare, Sara Ortega
 African Diaspora Studies, Edward Davis
 Economics, Paul Chen
 Music, Loretta Notareschi
 Staff - COD, Wanda Hasadsri
 Staff-Leg. Liaison, Anu Joshi

Resolutions as Amended and Approved

The following Resolution was approved as amended. The amended version reads as follows:

Resolution In Opposition to Prop. 64

Whereas, Prop. 64, a measure on the November general election ballot, would prevent environmental groups from bringing actions using the law that protects Californians against unfair, unlawful, and illegal business practices; and

Whereas, Prop. 64 is opposed by the American Lung Association of California, the AARP, the Sierra Club, the California Consumers Union, the California Nurses Association, and every major environmental organization in California; and

Resolutions as amended and approved (cont'd)

- 26 -

Resolution In Opposition to Prop. 64 (cont'd)

Whereas, Prop. 64's biggest contributors are car dealers and large corporations, like Exxon, Mobil, General Motors, British Petroleum/ARCO, Clorox, and Southern California Edison; and

Whereas, the current unfair competition law has been a very effective too in combating fraudulent business practices and has been used by a wide range of environmental organizations in the decades that it has been in effect; and

Whereas, the ballot measure would block any action that didn't involve both a personal injury, financial, or property loss, which means that actions brought under the law involving the loss of clean air and water, clear cutting of pristine forests, and destruction of the coast, would be barred; and

Whereas, Prop. 64, if passed, would block groups like Communities for a Better Environment from protecting the public health as it did when it forced the big oil companies to clean up their massive contamination of California's drinking water sources with the cancer-causing gasoline additive, MTBE; and

Whereas, Prop. 64 would eliminate much of what is good about the unfair competition law, while letting polluters and other corporate outlaws escape accountability for their bad actions; and

Whereas, the need for clean air, clean water, and a protected environment is not only pertinent to the public good, but to the quality of life of all graduate students;

Whereas, not only the health of the public, but the health and welfare of grad students is pertinent to this issue;

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly opposes Proposition 64.

The following Resolution was approved as amended. The amended version reads as follows:

Resolution In Support of Proposition 72

Whereas, Proposition 72, a measure on the November 2004 general election ballot, will guarantee health coverage to many of the 1.3 million Californians who do not currently have health insurance; and

Whereas, California taxpayers pay \$4.6 billion annually to cover emergency room and other health care bills for the uninsured; and

Whereas, extending health insurance to almost all working Californians will inevitably save tax dollars and relieve the burden on local emergency rooms; and

Whereas, the money saved by Proposition 72 can be used to pay for under-funded public higher education programs; and

Resolutions as amended and approved (cont'd)

- 27 -

Resolution In Support of Proposition 72 (cont'd)

Whereas, Proposition 72 will allow students who work full-time to receive health insurance through their employer; and

Whereas, Proposition 72 will allow students whose spouse, domestic partner, or parent(s) work full-time to receive health insurance through their spouse, domestic partner, or parent(s)'s employer; and

Whereas, access to quality health care is essential to all graduate students; and

Whereas, access to higher education and access to health care are fundamental human rights recognized and endorsed by the Graduate Assembly; and

Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Graduate Assembly endorses Proposition 72.